



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/541,845	04/03/2000	Jodi A. Dalvey	946.008US1	4258

7590 04/16/2003

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH
P.O. BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

HESS, BRUCE H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1774	9

DATE MAILED: 04/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/541,845	Applicant(s) Dalvey et al.
	Examiner Bruce Hess	Group Art Unit 1774

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1-21-03 (Election)

This action is FINAL.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above claim(s) 17-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).

All Some* None of the:

Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 2 and 3 Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1774

1. The restriction requirement of Paper No. 6 is adhered to and made final for the reasons of record.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 USC 112 (second paragraph) for the reasons set forth below:

- a. Claims 1-16 fail to recite an underlying support for the image transfer sheet;
- b. What and where is the "indicia" (see the last word in claim 1) in claims 1-6?; and
- c. In claim 6, how can an "indicia" be encapsulated?

3. The following claims are rejected under 35 USC 102 (b) as being anticipated.

Claims ~~1, 5, 7, 9 and 11~~ over Shimomine et al (USP 5,434,598); *dropped because of new matter*

Claims ~~1, 5, 7, 9 and 16~~ over Kiyoshi (JP 01037233); *1, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16*

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7 and 9-16 over either of the Sato et al patents (EP 0 881 092 or EP 0 933 225); and

Claims ~~1, 7 and 8~~ over Mitsuhide et al (EP 22 95973).

4. The following claims are rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over.

Shimomine et al (claims ~~1, 5, 7, 9 and 11~~); *1, 5, 7, 9, 11*

Kiyoshi (claims ~~1, 5, 7, 9 and 16~~); *1, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16*

Sato et al '092 or Sato et al '225 (claims 1, 2, ~~5-7 and 9-16~~); and *1-3, 4, 8*

Mitsuhide et al (claims 1-9, ~~11-14 and 16~~); and *1-9, 11-14, 16*

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16

6

All of these patents teach image transfer sheets comprising a support, a release layer and a polymer layer. The patents to Shimomine et al (see column 2, lines 48, 49 and 51-54; column 4, lines 31-33 and column 5, lines 4-6), Kiyoshi, Sato et al '092 (see page 3, lines 14-16; page 4, line 58; and page 6, line 31) and Sato et al '225 (see page 5, lines 34, 35 and 41; page 6, line 47) teach the advantages of employing titanium oxide in the polymer layer while the patent to Mitsuhide et al teach the advantages of employing titanium oxide in the release layer. The patents to Sato et al and Mitsuhide et al teach that the colored substrates can be fabric. The polymers employed by the prior art can be polypropylene (Sato et al '092 and '225), polyester and/or polyamide (Shimomine et al, Sato et al '092, Sato et al '225 and Mitsuhide et al) or EVA (Kiyoshi and Mitsuhide et al). Finally, the experimental modification of the prior art in order to ascertain optimum operating conditions (e.g., select the color of the substrate) fails to render applicants' claims patentable in the absence of unexpected results.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Bruce Hess at telephone number (703) 308-2402.

B. Hess/dh

April 15, 2003



BRUCE H. HESS
PRIMARY EXAMINER